

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,257	03/22/2001	Yutaka Kamezaki	55521 (70904)	6515
7:	590 11/05/2003		EXAMINER	
Edwards & Angell, LLP			NGUYEN, CHANH DUY	
P.O. Box 9169 Boston, MA (02209		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
·			2675	le
			DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			All .			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	V			
Advisory Action	09/815,257	KAMEZAKI ET AL.				
7. 2 0.20.7	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Chanh Nguyen	2675				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this application in the sapplication in the s	cation. A proper reply to ch places the application	to a on in			
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the maili b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for later than SIX MONTHS from the mail: S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF date on which the petition under 37 C of extension and the corresponding and the shortened statutory period for replice later than three months after the minus of the shortened statutory period for replice later than three months after the minus of the shortened statutory period for replice later than three months after the minus of the shortened statutory period for replications.	ing date of the final rejection FHE FINAL REJECTION. S FR 1.136(a) and the approphount of the fee. The appropy yoriginally set in the final Of	n. See MPEP oriate extension priate extension ffice action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed a	mendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Si		sidered but does NOT	place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims were appeared to the control of the control			nd an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-43</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)☐ approved or b)☐ disap	proved by the Examine	er.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
10.		Chanh Nguyen	fn			
		Primary Examiner V Art Unit: 2675				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented by applicant are not persuasive since all the limitations recited in the claims are met by Osamu, Taku and Sato as set forth in the rejection. For example, applicant argues that the horizontal lines in vertical period as set forth in the claim 43 are the scanning lines for the input video signal, and are not data lines. However, claim 43 does not require the horizontal lines on vertical period being the scanning lines. Similar to argument to claim 33, the limitation "separately" is not recited in the claim 33 as applicant's argument. The term "individually" recited in claim 33 broadly reads on "non-display area" of Osamu is simultaneously scanned, even the term "separately" still can be read on the scanning circuit of Osamu separately scanned display area and non-display area. Again, all the limitations recited in the claims are met by Osamu, Taku and Sato as set forth in the rejection.